

and, therefore, placing the aforementioned claims into independent form does not appear to be necessary.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 31 – 34, 38 through 47, 53, 59, 61 and 63 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,198,793 to Schultz et al. (hereinafter “the Schultz et al. patent”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that the present application claims priority to an application that pre-dates the Shultz et al. patent.

The present application claims priority to German Patent Application Serial No. 199 08 526.9, filed February 26, 1999 (hereinafter “the priority application”). The Schultz et al. patent has a filing date of May 4, 1999. Thus, the priority application pre-dates the Schultz et al. patent.

Claim 31 provides for an illumination system for scanning lithography. The system includes, *inter alia*, a field lens group that distorts a field, where the distortion is perpendicular to the scanning direction. The recital of the field lens group in claim 31 is similar to that of claim 1 of the priority document. Below, Applicant is providing a translation, to the best of Applicant’s ability, of claim 1 of the priority application.

#### Priority Application – Claim 1

German	English
Beleuchtungssystem für die Scanning-Lithographie mit Wellenlängen $\leq$ 193 nm, insbesondere die EUV-Lithographie, zur Ausleuchtung eines Schlitzes, umfassend	Illumination system for scanning lithography with wavelength $\leq$ 193 nm, particularly EUV-lithography, for the illumination of a slit, comprising
1.1 eine Lichtquelle	1.1 a light source
1.2 mindestens einen Feldspiegel oder eine Feldlinse dadurch gekennzeichnet, daß	1.2 at least one field mirror or one field lens characterized in that
1.3 der/die Feldspiegel oder die Feldlinse(n) derart geformt sind, daß das beleuchtete Feld in der Retikalebene senkrecht zur Scanrichtung verzeichnet ist.	1.3 the field mirror(s) or the filed lens(es) is/are shaped so that the illuminated field is distorted in the reticle-plane perpendicular to the scanning direction.

Since (a) the priority document pre-dates the Schultz et al. patent, and (b) the recital of the field lens group in claim 31 is similar to that of claim 1 of the priority document, the Schultz et al. patent does not anticipate claim 31.

Claims 32 – 34, 38 through 47, 53, 59, 61 and 63 depend from claim 31. As such, the Schultz et al. patent does not anticipate claims 32 – 34, 38 through 47, 53, 59, 61 and 63.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(a) rejection of claims 31 – 34, 38 through 47, 53, 59, 61 and 63.

The Office Action included a PTO-892 that listed several references. However, the Schultz et al. patent was not among the listed references. Applicant respectfully requests that with its next official communication, the Office includes a PTO-892 listing the Schultz et al. patent.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.  
Reg. No. 28,468  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: 203-327-4500  
Fax: 203-327-6401

September 9, 2003  
Date